

Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Meeting Summary January 24, 2008

Updates

John Fischer, MassDEP, announced two upcoming events:

- C&D Summit, January 25, 2008, at Doubletree Hotel in Westborough
- 8th Annual Organics Recycling Summit & Training, March 4-5, 2008, at the Best Western Royal Plaza Hotel in Marlborough: To register online go to:
<http://mass.gov/dep/recycle/reduce/summit08.htm>

Toxics Use Reduction Act (TURA) Resource Conservation Planning

John Fischer gave a brief explanation of the new Resource Conservation Planning option under the Toxics Use Reduction Act (TURA).

The Toxics Use Reduction Act was passed in 1989 to help industries in certain SIC codes to reduce their use of listed toxic chemicals. TURA facilities have been required to: (1) report the use of listed toxic chemicals annually; (2) develop an initial plan to reduce the use of listed chemicals; and (3) submit plan updates every 2 years after the first plan. John noted that over time, TURA facilities have made impressive achievements, reducing use of toxic chemicals by 41% and toxic byproducts by 65% (when adjusted for production.)

In 2006, the TURA statute was substantially revised. As part of the new statute, facilities that have completed three toxics use reduction (TUR) planning cycles have the flexibility to choose from two other options – implementing an environmental management system or conducting resource conservation planning. Resource conservation planning enables participating companies to use the time and resources that they would have applied to TUR planning and instead develop a plan to reduce their use of energy, water, materials in the solid waste stream, listed chemicals used below thresholds, or other chemicals that are not listed but present opportunities for reduction.

From a waste and materials management perspective, resource conservation planning offers potential for companies to reduce materials use and waste by reducing material inputs to their processes. While this planning process is currently focused on TURA facilities, it may provide useful opportunities and benefits for other business sectors.

More information on Resource Conservation Planning is available on the MassDEP web site at: <http://www.mass.gov/dep/toxics/tura/rcplan.htm>. Or, you can contact Julia Wolfe at Julia.wolfe@state.ma.us.

Recycled Paper Campaign

Claire Sullivan, MassRecycle, gave a presentation on the Mass Recycles Paper campaign. This presentation is posted on the MassDEP web site, along with these meeting notes.

In response to a question about paper recycling outreach in post offices, the campaign poster information has been sent to all Massachusetts post offices and they have been asked to display this poster to encourage paper recycling. Claire asked that reports of non-participating post offices be sent to Karen Patterson at paper@massrecycle.org so that MassRecycle can follow up and encourage them to post the information. In response to a question, Claire also explained that MassRecycle expects to expand the Mass Recycles paper campaign to commercial paper in the near future

For more information on Mass Recycles Paper, see the accompanying PowerPoint presentation and the Campaign website: www.MassRecyclesPaper.org. Interested parties may also contact Claire Sullivan at ssrcclaire@comcast.net.

MassDEP Emerging Contaminants Workgroup

Barbara Kwetz, MassDEP, outlined the history and work of the Emerging Contaminants Workgroup (ECWG), and invited attendees to suggest additional emerging contaminants for attention.

The model for ECWG came from the process MassDEP used to address perchlorate found in drinking water on the Cape that was traced to the Massachusetts Military Reservation. Perchlorate also was found in the course of testing other water supplies in the state. This contaminant results from fireworks, blasting, and medical device production, among other sources. MassDEP determined that action was needed because perchlorate is an endocrine disruptor with health impacts at very low levels.

In 2006, MassDEP promulgated the first drinking water standard for perchlorate in the nation after engaging stakeholders on the scientific data. The standard was set at 2 ppb, and clean-up standards were developed for the MA military reservation. Also, MassDEP published guidance to help towns minimize impacts from firework displays.

Having developed capacity through this initiative, MassDEP decided to become more proactive about other emerging contaminants. With the aim of identifying problems earlier, the Emerging Contaminants Workgroup was formed and includes expertise from all MassDEP Bureaus.

The Workgroup has defined emerging contaminants as hazardous materials or mixtures (naturally occurring or manmade chemical, microbial or radiological substances) that are characterized by having:

- A perceived or real threat to human health, public safety or the environment;
- No published health standards or guidelines;

- Insufficient or limited available toxicological information or toxicity information that is evolving or being re-evaluated; or,
- Significant new source, pathway, or detection limit information.

The Workgroup has developed a preliminary list of emerging contaminants and has established a framework to screen and prioritize these contaminants. The preliminary list is comprised of about 80 emerging contaminants. Approximately 30 of these have been placed on a Watch List for further information gathering, 9 have been identified as long-term priorities for further evaluation and 4 have been nominated for short-term actions. The list will be updated every 6 months, followed by screening and prioritization. The emerging contaminants are listed in the handout posted with these meeting notes. Barbara Kwetz invited meeting participants to review this list and suggest additional contaminants for the Work Group to consider.

For additional information, see the MassDEP web site at:

<http://www.mass.gov/dep/toxics/stypes/emercfs.htm> or contact Barbara Kwetz at: Barbara.kwetz@state.ma.us.

Solid Waste Master Plan – Discussion of Potential New Economic and Regulatory Waste Reduction Tools

John Fischer introduced this topic with a brief review of the *Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan* published in December 2000, followed by the *Master Plan Revision* published in 2006 to reflect program and funding changes occurring since 2000. The 2006 Revision maintained the overall goals and policy framework, but updated the Plan strategies. Revised strategies established in 2006 were to:

- Prioritize efforts
- Target streams with the most diversion potential
- Leverage markets
- Build new partnerships (e.g., with supermarkets, hospitals)
- Increase enforcement (e.g. increasing waste ban enforcement)

Since 2006, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions and energy have emerged as priority issues for Massachusetts. The state's environmental policies, including the Solid Waste Master Plan, are being re-examined in this context. MassDEP is reviewing the Master Plan to recommend how to most effectively use a combination of regulatory tools and incentives to achieve our waste reduction goals and minimize the amount of waste disposed, as well to achieve climate change and energy benefits. John invited attendees to suggest ideas for the new plan along these lines. Meeting participants offered the following comments for the new master plan:

- Consider more waste-to-energy (WTE) technologies that produce electricity or direct heat, such as landfill gas recovery or anaerobic digesters, and track/assess their potential
- Start thinking about lifting the moratorium on municipal waste combustors (MWC), but only for what is left after optimizing recycling and diversion
- Introduce the concept of Zero Waste and look at other programs around the country

- A current statewide waste composition study is needed to support planning; this should include regions where disposal is done by WTE
- Evaluate best use of public money — WTE compared to increased diversion
- Reinstate the Clean Environment Fund
- Evaluate Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards relative to waste, e.g., RECs for gas from digesters, or energy from combustion of “dirty” C&D wood
- Need better waste ban enforcement that reaches upstream to generators
- Commercial and institutional sectors must be more engaged to do their part in recycling and diversion
- If the main reason for the WTE moratorium is mercury emissions, then issue a standard for mercury and see if it can be met by existing BACT; if so, then revisit the moratorium;
- If a mercury standard is set, this gives WTE companies a basis for R&D investments
- Consider beneficial reuse of MWC ash (e.g., flowable fill, concrete)
- Highlight/evaluate emerging technologies (e.g., pyrolysis), and see where they can fit into the waste management system
- Much more state-funded public outreach is needed to mobilize citizens/businesses to boost recycling to its full potential
- Outreach started with the Paper Campaign could be extended to a statewide effort
- Consider incentives for private companies to develop new technologies and plants, e.g., recycling and conversion technologies
- Look at bioreactor landfills; Los Angeles County and New York City are developing these
- Streamline permitting/BUDs for favorable technologies
- Coordinate with Boards of Health on siting issues
- The Lowell Center Clean Technology Report recommends links between reuse/recycling and energy efficiency programs (e.g., link recycled product manufacturers with energy efficiency technical assistance)
- Implement recycled product certification to reward local manufacturers using recycled content, and check Asian imports that claim, but do not always contain, recycled materials
- Evaluate the regional context of our waste-shed, including the long-haul impacts of waste export.

John thanked participants for these suggestions. This discussion will continue at the next SWAC meeting on April 24, 2008, and at other public meetings to be announced.

Review of Final Draft 2006 Solid Waste and Waste Reduction Data

John Fischer, MassDEP, presented highlights from the Draft 2006 Solid Waste Data Report due to be released shortly. This information is included in two handouts posted with these meeting notes.

In response to a question about whether there is sufficient MRF and C&D throughput capacity in the state to absorb this increase, John Fischer noted that MRFs do not have daily capacity limits like those required for landfills or transfer stations. Past efforts by MassDEP to establish

recycling capacity figures have not provided clear information. MassDEP did prepare an estimate for food waste generation and processing capacity where clearer information about facility capacity is available. That analysis showed a need for significant additional food waste processing capacity to support increased diversion.

MassDEP will send a notice to the SWAC when the 2006 Solid Waste Data Update is released. For further information, please see the two handouts posted with this summary or contact John Fischer at: john.fischer@state.ma.us.